

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are all the claims pending in the application, as claims 18 and 19 are hereby added.¹

Applicant submits the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

The Examiner objects to claims 15 and 16 for minor informalities. Proposed corrections are set forth herein. Applicant submits the amendments should be entered as they do not raise new issues, and respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Claims 1-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ivan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,877,501; hereinafter "Ivan"). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ivan. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant herein amends independent claim to recite, *inter alia* "wherein the handheld portable operating portion is used in a handheld manner."²

The Examiner cites the base station (44) and computer (50) of Ivan as corresponding to the handheld portable operating portion of claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Instead, Applicant notes neither the image processing computer (50) nor the base station (44) in Ivan is used in handheld manner, as claim 1 requires. Consequently, an operator has to operate the detector assembly (1) of Ivan from the place where the computer is installed.

By contrast, "the handheld portable operating portion" recited in amended claim 1 is portable and operational in handheld manner. Therefore, in the claimed invention, the handheld

¹ Applicant submits the subject matter of claims 18 and 19 are supported, for example at page 18, lines 3-15 of the Specification.

² Applicant submits the amended subject matter is supported, for example, at page 5, lines 9-14.

nature of the handheld portable operating portion permits portability of the cassette main body. Further, Applicant submits the feature of being able to use the handheld portable operating portion in a handheld manner is important and available in medical emergency situations. Ivan fails to teach or suggest this unique feature of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant submits independent claim 1 is patentable over Ivan for at least these reasons. Similarly, Applicant submits independent claims 15, 18 and 19 are patentable over Ivan for reasons analogous to those stated above regarding independent claim 1. Further, Applicant submits dependent claims 2-13, 16 and 17 are also patentable over Ivan, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on independent claims 1 and 15.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of claim 14, Applicant submits the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits claim 14 is patentable, at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Application No.: 10/684,705

Attorney Docket No.: Q77937

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark C. Davis", with a large, stylized loop at the end.

Mark C. Davis
Registration No. 60,552

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 14, 2007